

DAN R. WAITE  
Nevada Bar No.4078  
LEWIS ROCA ROTHGERBER, LLP  
3993 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 600  
Las Vegas, NV 89169  
Telephone: (702) 949-8200  
Facsimile: (702) 949-8398  
Email: [dwaite@lrrlaw.com](mailto:dwaite@lrrlaw.com)

BRIAN P. O'MEARA  
*Pro Hac Vice* IL Bar No. 6275624  
FORDE LAW OFFICES LLP  
111 West Washington, Suite 1100  
Chicago, Illinois 60602  
Telephone: (312) 641-1441  
Facsimile: (312) 641-1288  
Email: [bomeara@fordellp.com](mailto:bomeara@fordellp.com)

*Attorneys for Defendant CNU Online Holdings, LLC,  
incorrectly sued as Enova International, Inc.*

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

FLEMMING KRISTENSEN, individually and on behalf of a class of similarly situated individuals,

Plaintiff,

VS.

CREDIT PAYMENT SERVICES INC., a Nevada corporation, f/k/a MYCASHNOW.COM INC., ENOVA INTERNATIONAL, INC., an Illinois corporation, PIONEER FINANCIAL SERVICES, INC., a Missouri corporation, LEADPILE LLC, a Delaware limited liability company, and CLICKMEDIA LLC d/b/a NET1PROMOTIONS LLC, a Georgia limited liability company,

Defendant.

Case No.: 2:12-cv-00528-APG-PAL

**CNU ONLINE HOLDINGS, LLC'S,  
INCORRECTLY SUED AS ENOVA  
INTERNATIONAL, INC., RESPONSE TO  
PLAINTIFF'S RULE 56(c)(2)  
OBJECTIONS TO AND MOTION TO  
STRIKE THE DECLARATION OF  
MICHAEL FERRY AND OTHER  
EVIDENCE SUBMITTED IN SUPPORT  
OF DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS FOR  
SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

Judge: Hon Andrew P. Gordon

Magistrate Judge: Hon. Peggy A. Leen

1           Defendant CNU Online Holdings, LLC, incorrectly sued as Enova International, Inc.  
2 (“Enova”)<sup>1</sup>, by and through its attorneys, files this Response to Plaintiff’s Rule 56(c)(2) Objections  
3 to and Motion to Strike the Declaration of Michael Ferry and Other Evidence Submitted in Support  
4 of Defendants’ Motions for Summary Judgment (Dkt. 268).

5 DATED this 4<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2014

LEWIS ROCA ROTHGERBER LLP

By: /s/ Dan R. Waite  
DAN R. WAITE  
Nevada Bar No.4078  
LEWIS ROCA ROTHGERBER, LLP  
3993 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 600  
Las Vegas, NV 89169  
Email: [dwaite@lrrlaw.com](mailto:dwaite@lrrlaw.com)

BRIAN P. O'MEARA  
*Pro Hac Vice* IL Bar No. 6275624  
FORDE LAW OFFICES LLP  
111 West Washington, Suite 1100  
Chicago, Illinois 60602  
Email: [bomeara@fordellp.com](mailto:bomeara@fordellp.com)

*Attorneys for Defendant CNU Online Holdings, LLC, incorrectly sued as Enova International, Inc.*

## MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

19 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56(c)(2) provides that “[a] party may object that the  
20 material cited to support or dispute a fact cannot be presented in a form that would be admissible in  
21 evidence.” Fed.R.Civ.P. 56(c)(2). Once challenged, the proponent of the evidence may explain  
22 “the admissible form that is anticipated.” Fed.R.Civ.P. 56 advisory committee note.  
23

With respect to Enova, Plaintiff objects to and moves to strike portions of the deposition transcripts of James Gee and Michael Ferry – Exhibits C and D respectively to Enova’s Motion for

<sup>28</sup> <sup>1</sup> For ease of reference, this Response will refer to the defendant as “Enova.”

1 Summary Judgment.<sup>2</sup> (Dkt. 268, pp. 4-5). Plaintiff claims that the testimony is not based on the  
 2 deponents' personal knowledge. In particular, Plaintiff asks this Court to strike pages 23-24 of Mr.  
 3 Gee's transcript and pages 63-64, 89, 119 and 141 of Mr. Ferry's transcript. Enova cited the  
 4 testimony at issue in support of the following three sentences:

- 5 • Mr. Gee assumed that the consumers associated with the phone numbers received from 360  
 6 Data had opted-in to receive text messages and that the phone numbers had been compared  
 7 against "Do Not Call" and suppression lists. (Ex. C, Gee Dep., pp. 23-24, 83, 89).
- 8 • For its part, 360 Data made sure that every record had opt-out and opt-in information. (Ex.  
 9 D, Ferry Dep., pp. 63-64, 77-78, 89, 118-119).
- 10 • 360 Data was aware of the TCPA and always endeavored to comply with the TCPA. (*Id.*,  
 11 pp. 79-80, 141).

12 (Dkt. 233, pp. 6-7).

13 Plaintiff argues that the testimony is cited for the proposition that Plaintiff (or other class  
 14 members) "consented" to receive the text message sent in this case, but that it is not based on the  
 15 deponents' personal knowledge. (Dkt. 268, pp. 4-5). As such, Plaintiff contends that the testimony  
 16 is inadmissible under Federal Rule of Evidence 602. But Plaintiff's motion, at least as it relates to  
 17 Enova, is based on a faulty premise – that Enova cited testimony solely to support a consent  
 18 argument.

19 Enova, however, cited the testimony to describe the business practices of 360 Data and AC  
 20 Referral and to show that Enova had no control over AC Referral or 360 Data. This testimony is  
 21 relevant to the issue of vicarious liability. The testimony illustrates what Mr. Gee assumed  
 22 regarding the phone numbers he received from 360 Data, what Mr. Ferry purportedly did with opt-  
 23 in and opt-out information, and Mr. Ferry's knowledge of and efforts to comply with the Telephone  
 24 Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA"). Enova offered this testimony as further evidence that Enova  
 25 had no control whatsoever over AC Referral, 360 Data or the text message sent by AC Referral in  
 26

---

27 <sup>2</sup> To the extent that Plaintiff has objected to and moved to strike the Declaration of Michael Ferry and other  
 28 evidence submitted in support of the codefendants' motions for summary judgment, Enova adopts the  
 responses filed by codefendants.

1 this case. This is clear when read in context with the other testimony Enova cited in its Motion for  
 2 Summary Judgment, which Plaintiff conveniently ignores. Indeed, Enova cited testimony from Mr.  
 3 Gee and Mr. Ferry that AC Referral and 360 Data had no relationship, contractual or otherwise,  
 4 with Enova; that Enova never exercised any control over AC Referral or 360 Data; and that prior to  
 5 their depositions, neither Gee nor Ferry had ever even heard of Enova. (Dkt. 233, pp. 6-7).

6 Furthermore, Mr. Gee clearly has personal knowledge of the assumptions he made as he  
 7 operated his business and as he engaged in text message campaigns. Similarly, Mr. Ferry has  
 8 personal knowledge of what he generally did or did not do with opt-in and opt-out information and  
 9 his knowledge of and endeavors to comply with the TCPA. Because both witnesses have personal  
 10 knowledge of their own business practices, the testimony as cited by Enova is admissible under  
 11 Federal Rule of Evidence 602 to demonstrate that Enova had no knowledge of or control over any  
 12 of AC Referral or 360 Data's business practices, including the alleged sending of text messages.

### 13 CONCLUSION

14 For the foregoing reasons, Enova respectfully requests that this Court deny Plaintiff's Rule  
 15 56(c)(2) Objections to and Motion to Strike as it relates to Exhibits C and D to Enova's Motion for  
 16 Summary Judgment and enter whatever further relief this Court deems just and appropriate.

17 DATED this 4<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2014

18 LEWIS ROCA ROTHGERBER LLP

19 By: /s/ Dan R. Waite

20 DAN R. WAITE  
 21 Nevada Bar No.4078  
 22 LEWIS ROCA ROTHGERBER, LLP  
 23 3993 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 600  
 24 Las Vegas, NV 89169  
 25 Email: [dwaite@lrrlaw.com](mailto:dwaite@lrrlaw.com)

26 BRIAN P. O'MEARA  
 27 Pro Hac Vice IL Bar No. 6275624  
 28 FORDE LAW OFFICES LLP

111 West Washington, Suite 1100  
 Chicago, Illinois 60602  
 Email: [bomeara@fordellp.com](mailto:bomeara@fordellp.com)  
*Attorneys for Defendant CNU Online Holdings, LLC, incorrectly sued as Enova International, Inc.*

LEWIS ROCA  
 ROTHGERBER

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that I am an employee of Lewis Roca Rothgerber LLP, and that on this day, I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing: **CNU ONLINE HOLDINGS, LLC'S, INCORRECTLY SUED AS ENOVA INTERNATIONAL, INC., RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S RULE 56(c)(2) OBJECTIONS TO AND MOTION TO STRIKE THE DECLARATION OF MICHAEL FERRY AND OTHER EVIDENCE SUBMITTED IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT** to be served via the Court's E-Filing System CM/ECF, on all interested parties in the above-referenced matter. The date and time of the electronic service is in place of the date and place of deposit in the mail.

DATED this 4<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2014.

/s/ Luz Horvath  
An Employee of Lewis Roca Rothgerber LLP

LEWIS ROCA  
ROTHGERBER